DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 786 SP 026 017

AUTHOR James, Gregory
TITLE Some Problems in In-Service Teacher Training.
PUB DATE Nov 84
NOTE 18p.; Paper prepared for presentation at the J.A.L.T. Conference (Tokyo, Japan, November 1984). Document contains light type.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; Chinese; Curriculum Development; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; English Teacher Education; Foreign Countries; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Program Development; *Second Language Instruction

ABSTRACT

The problems of motivation and evaluation in the inservice training of primary school techers of English at the Institute of Language in Education in Hong Kong are discussed. The Institute was founded with the goal of improving the standard of English and Chinese in the schools and the community and to facilitate bilingualism in the Colony. A description is given of inservice training programs established to improve the skills of teachers of both Chinese and English. Included in the description is a discussion on how the syllabi used in the schools were reformed and the development of a new syllabus for English. Problems involved in implementing effective inservice education for the reformed curriculum and syllabi are analyzed in the light of how the teachers reacted to inservice workshops and their attitudes toward an evaluation system used to critique their work and progress. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257786

SOME PROBLEMS IN IN-SERVICE TEACHER TRAINING

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. James
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Gregory James

(Institute of Language in Education, Hong Kong & Language Centre, University of Exeter, England)

Paper prepared for presentation at the J.A.L.T. Conference, Tokyo, November, 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Fragestellung

> If teaching is communicating, and if evaluation is a form of feedback, it would seem we need to bring our grading procedures in line with the communication principle we teach.
> (Bock, 1975:133)

Preamble

In this paper, I want to discuss some of the problems of motivation and evaluation that I have encountered in the in-service training of primary school teachers of English, during my current two-year leave-of-absence attachemnt from the University of Exeter to the recently established Institute of Language in Education in Hong Kong.

Background

The Institute of Language in Education (I.L.E.) was established in 1982, as a major feature of the Hong Kong Government's *Language Package*, approved by the Executive Council in May, 1981 (E.D., 1981a, 1981b, Guterres, 1982),

> aiming to improve the standard of English and Chinese in Schools and the community
> (E.D., 1981a:1)

in response to concern over

> the alleged downward spiral in language competence of Hong Kong students
> (Llewellyn, 1982:25)

In the Hong Kong Government's overall review of its education system, published in June, 1981, some of the provisions of the proposed *Language Package* are detailed as

SP026017

> ... a group of co-ordinated measures to raise the standard of both [Chinese and English] ... in schools and thereby facilitate bilingualism. An Institute of Language in Education is to be established, to bring about improvements in language teaching and learning (with particular emphasis on the training of language teachers), together with a Chinese Language Foundation, which will be responsible, among other things, for the production of lively productions in Chinese ... to enhance the teaching of that subject. Other related measures include the development of remedial teaching in Chinese and English in junior secondary forms, the provision in schools of wire-free induction loop systems with individual headsets (in order to provide pupils with good models of English pronunciation and usage) and the introduction of a new subject, language and communication, in the sixth-form curriculum in order to strengthen communication skills in both languages. The present English curriculum is already being extensively revised to give pupils more opportunity to use the language purposefully as a tool of communication.
> (Hong Kong Government, 1981:112-113; see also E.D., 1098la; 1981b; Guterres, 1982)

To date, for example, some 850 schools have been provided with wire-free induction loop systems, and over 100 seminars, attended by more than 4,000 teachers, have been conducted to give instructions and advice on their use.

In 1981-1982, a poanel of four overseas experts, under the chairmanship of Sir John Llewellyn, former Vice-Chancellor of my own parent institution, and erstwhile Director-General of the British Council, was invited *inter alia*

> to identify the future aims of the education system, to consider the coherence and effectiveness of the service, to identify areas which may require strengthening and to make recommendations on priorities in its further development.
> (Llewellyn, 1982:115).

Chapter 1 of Section III of their Report is entitled "Language in the Classroom" and is devoted to a discussion of language teaching.

> The time required for language instruction tends to 'crowd out' other curriculum areas such as physical education and the performing and visual arts. A school day in Hong Kong must have more time devoted to language than is the case in countries which are officially monolingual. Consequently, the Hong Kong education enterprise must either become very efficient in teaching and learning methods in order to meet the necessary variety of education objectives - or (the enterprise) work harder and longer. There is simply not enough time in the school day or year to cope with the language requirement as well as to cover the other core subjects in the same depth that can be achieved in many other nations.
> (Llewellyn, 1982:25)

(Dr. Alice Pierson, 1981:28; Tongue & Gibbons, 1982:65.) The Panel, { *1 word deleted by censor* }, did not commit themselves as to any theoretical and practical justifications for the alleged 'drop in standards' of English and Chinese in schools { *56 words deleted by censor* }. They did, however, make { *1 word deleted by censor* } reference to the need for enhancing the quality of teaching through professional training for teachers.

> While quantitative needs loom large, there is also the need to upgrade the quality of many long-serving byt inadequately prepared teachers. Many primary school teachers have completed only one or two years of pre-service training and have had little access to in-service courses. { *28 words of quotation deleted by censor* }.
> (Llewellyn, 1982:66 - original emphasis)

> ... the effectiveness of any education system is largely determined by the capacity and commitment of the teaching service. A critical issue is the language competency of teachers in Hong Kong schools, which largely falls short of the bilingual proficiency needed for effective teaching.
> (Llewellyn, 1982:112)

The establishment of a specialist language centre, to provide in-service language and pedagogical training for Hong Kong teachers had, indeed, long been mooted and extensively discussed (see e.g., Hong Kong Government, 1952; Hensman, 1962:6). An English Language Teaching Centre was opened in 1965, and continues today, under the auspices of the Advisory Inspectorate, to offer advisory and instructional services to teachers, as well as making available to the profession a library and a large collection of teaching aids and materials. In 1974, a Chinese Language Teaching Centre was established along similar lines. The terms of reference of the I.L.E. differ somewhat from those of the L.T.C.s, however.

> The Institute of Language in Education aims to raise professional standards in the training, both initial and in-service, of non-graduate teachers of English and Chinese. As a "centre of excellence" in all matters relating to language teaching and learning in schools, the Institute will promote research, design and develop prototype instructional material, serve as a bank of language teaching resources, be an information centre and clearing house and provide a central venue for all language teaching professionals. In time it could become a regional and international centre for English and Chinese language teaching.
> (E.D., 1981a, 1981b; cf. Guterres, 1982)

The I.L.E. might be imagined, then, as fulfilling similar functions to those of the Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages in Hyderabad (for materials production), the Regional Institute of English in Bangalore (for in-service teacher training) and the Regional Language Centre in Singapore (for research). It is, perhaps, no coincidence that the Language Adviser (later, Consultant to the I.L.E.) attached to the Education Department in Hong Kong from the British Council from 1977 to 1981, to advise on syllabuses and methodology in language teaching, and who, { *inserted by*

censor: with colleagues in the E.D. and in the community) saw the development of the I.L.E. to fruition, had previously had close professional connections with these institutions in India and Singapore. Indeed, some 12 years ago, I myself taught at the Regional Institute of English in Bangalore - when Mr Jo Barnett, now the British Council Representative in Japan, was its Director of Studies; and my current Director, the Director of the I.L.E. in Hong Kong, is Dr Verner Bickley, who, from 1966 to 1970, was the British Council's first English Language Officer in Japan!

I.L.E. in-service training programmes

The I.L.E. has two Divisions, one concerned with the teaching of English, the other with Chinese; at present we have 150 primary school teachers on course in each Division. The current staff comprises 3 Vice-Principals, 3 Senior Lecturers and 6 Graduate Lecturers in each Division, giving a ratio of course participants to teaching staff of 12·5:1, which is considered extremely favourable in Hong Kong. In the English Division, two of the Vice-Principals are native-speakers of English (myself, and one other); the other ten staff are Cantonese speakers, about half of whom have undertaken tertiary level courses in Britian or the United States. {*22 words deleted by censor; replaced by:* During its first two years, the I.L.E. has given priority to mounting} four-month full-time in-service refresher courses for primary school teachers {*35 words deleted by censor* }. A modest programme of research has begun {*inserted by censor:* including an analysis of participant needs} (see Kong, 1984a; 1984b), {but} the I.L.E. is still in an embryonic stage. With 900 teachers having undergone courses in the past two years, there has {*inserted by censor:* so far} been very little time {*4 words deleted by censor* } for staff to devote themselves to {*17 words deleted by censor, replaced by:* the other elements of the programme}.

Within the English Division, the {*inserted by censor:* present} courses are designed to give participants a thorough background to the rationale for the recently introduced syllabus reform for English classes at primary level, to extend their repertoire of language teaching skills and techniques, and to improve their personal command of, especially spoken, English, particular attention being paid to the language of the 'English' classroom.

The syllabus for these refresher courses owes a great deal to the 1979 version of the examination syllabus of the Royal Society of Arts Diploma for Overseas Teachers of English, on which it was largely modelled. Indeed, our course participants are given the opportunity, on a voluntary basis, of taking this examination, and for the two entries since the I.L.E. has been established, a healthy overall pass rate of 87·5% has been achieved.

1981 syllabus reform in Hong Kong

Syllabuses are published by the government in Hong Kong, but schools are at liberty to choose *how* the syllabuses are taught. (See Etherton, 1981 for a {*original word replaced by* discussion *by censor*} of the Hong Kong system.) Any textbooks may be used by schools, provided they have the approval of the Education Department, and lists of such approved textbooks are regularly reviewed and updated. At the beginning of this academic year, the first stage of the implementation of the new syllabus for English was begun, with the first three classes at primary level; the remaining three classes will adopt the new syllabus from September, 1985. The new syllabus (C.D.C., 1981) replaces the 1976 syllabus (C.D.C., 1976), which was essentially structure-oriented. (For a very brief historical sketch of the main currents of English language teaching and teacher education in Hong Kong see Cheng, 1983; 1984; Bickley, forthcoming.) The 1981 syllabus has been termed 'communicative', though this may very well be a misnomer (cf. Johnson, 1981:47n

> Some writers have identified the communicative approach with functional syllabuses; however, ... there is no basis for such a claim. Teaching programmes based upon lists of functions are no more intrinsically communicative than programmes based upon lists of notions or linguistic items, or situations, or topics.)

> The principal objective of the English language curriculum in the schools of Hong Kong is to provide every pupil with the opportunity to develop the maximum degree of functional competence in English of which he or she is capable given the constraints inherent in the situation, in particular competence in those domains of use which are specially appropriate to the Hong Kong situation.
> (C.D.C., 1981:11)

Justifications for the form and content of the Hong Kong syllabus may be found in Tongue, 1979; 1980; and Tongue & Gibbons, 1982 (for a brief critique, see Ho, 1981; see also Chau, 1984). The emphasis for the justification lies in the elaboration of the Hong Kong learners' *needs* for and *interests* in learning English, and several pages of the syllabus are devoted to a discussion of the functions of English within the Hong Kong context (C.D.C., 1981:8-14). The syllabus writers do {*original word deleted by censor and replaced by* state}, however:

> At the beginning stages in lower Primary in particular, even short-term needs may not have a great deal of relevance. It is necessary at this level, then, to depend upon the intrinsic interest of the learning activities, and the satisfaction that comes from being able to carry them out successfully, for the learner's motivation to be maintained.
> (C.D.C., 1981:13 - my emphasis)

It is particularly this notion of *motivation* that is at the root of many of the training problems that we face - motivation not only of the primary school learners of English *by* their teachers, but *of* their teachers as well. Many of our course participants are very experienced classroom practitioners.

> "They may have taught for 15 years or more. However, within this period, many of them may not have had the opportunity of attending any kind of retraining or refresher course. .... they have to get used to listening to new teaching ideas and have to re-examine themselves. So it is quite traumatic."
> (V.C. Bickley, in Kong, 1984a)

All our participants are nominated by their school heads, though some do volunteer for nomination to attend the course. Their age range is great: from mid-twenties to mid-fifties; their initial training and subsequent teaching experiences vary enormously. In the context, then, of designing refresher courses for these teachers, a population whose common feature is that each person is a non-graduate Chinese teacher of English (among other subjects) at primary level in Hong Kong, I should like to devote the rest of this paper to discussing some of the problems that we have encountered, adopting as my framework two of the four 'neglected issues' adumbrated by Ted Rodgers in *E.L.T. Documents 104* (Rodgers, 1979). Each of Rodgers' focus areas concerns, in some way, the vital question of *teacher motivation*, to which I shall add *teacher evaluation*, a related matter which has been engaging our increasing attention in recent months at the Institute of Language in Education.

Initial motivation and teachers' commitment to the programme

Rodgers' first issue is that of the *initial engagemnent of teacher attention and commitment to a new instructional programme*.

> Any change in curriculum, or in prescribed materials, requires to be accompanied or preceded by a comprehensive campaign of information, explanation, discussion and practical familiarisation courses, involving every single teacher who will be affected.
> (Strevens, 1982:30)

The proposed Language Package, including the syllabus reform, for Hong Kong was, for a considerable period, a matter of intense discussion; and several Working Parties were established, at various times, to debate different aspects of it. People from all strata of the educational community in Hong Kong were consulted and were involved in these preliminary discussions. Now that the syllabus has been adopted, practical familiarisation courses for all English-language teachers in Hong Kong have been and are being conducted part-time by the English Language Teaching Centre, and, commissioned by the Education Department, the British Council; and full-time by the Institute of Language in Education. The I.L.E.'s four-month courses are, by far, the most comprehensive and intensive of those hitherto offered in Hong Kong, outwith the universities and the course programmes were to a large extent modelled on the R.S.A.'s (1979) D.O.T.E. syllabus, adapted, where practicable, to local conditions.

We may usefully compare the development of the I.L.E.'s courses against a model of curriculum processes, e.g., that of Taba (1962), cited in Richards, 1984:12, which gives seven steps in the design and development of a programme, relating needs analysis to subsequent phases:

Step 1	Diagnosis of needs
Step 2	Formulation of objectives
Step 3	Selection of content
Step 4	Organization of content
Step 5	Selection of learning experiences
Step 6	Organization of learning experiences
Step 7	Determination of what to evaluate and means to evaluate.

What, if any, formal diagnosis of Hong Kong teachers' needs for reorientation was undertaken, I do not know. These reorientation courses for experienced teachers were, apparently, justified by the fact of the 'perceived' drop in standards and the introduction of the new syllabus. Thus there had to be a certain amount of formal input explaining to teachers the rationale behind the new syllabus, the new perspectives on teaching methodology consequent upon its introduction into the territory and some detail of the philosophy and content of the new series of textbooks available { *11 words deleted by censor* }. The teachers' needs were, then, formulated { *3 words deleted by censor* } according to the imminent change in situation. The language content of the I.L.E. course was included to help teachers improve their own proficiency in the subject they were teaching. The objectives of the course were based on those perceived needs. The selection of the course content was, apparently, a matter of committee decision, using the R.S.A.'s D.O.T.E. syllabus as a yardstick.

As to organisation, the formal input consists of lectures on methodology and some elementary applied linguistic theory, as considered by the course designers relevant to the teachers' situation. Most of our participants have not attended long courses during their teaching careers, and are unaware of much of the progress on the methodological and applied linguistic fronts which has informed curriculum development and classroom practice over the past few years. Many practical workshops are included in the timetable, as are tutorials, small-group language proficiency sessions and language laboratory exercises. There is also one component of experimental teaching, where individual participants teach group-planned lessons to classes in a nearby 'affiliated school'. During the course, participants have, in addition, to complete a certain number of reading assignments, monitored by written exercises, and, by the end of the course, each participant has to present a written project in the form of an extended essay, accompanied, where appropriate, by materials relevant to their classroom situation.

Design of training programmes in which the methodology of training parallels the recommended methodology for classroom practice.

Rodgers' second issue is the design for training programmes to parallel or reflect the recommended methodology for classroom practice. The {*inserted by censor* : original} designers of the I.L.E. course apparently did not consciously attempt this parallel. Consequently, we find ourselves talking {*inserted by censor*: some of the time} about student-centered learning, self-access learning, communicative activities, group work, pair work and the like via *ex cathedra* lectures to 75 or 150 participants at a time. The selection of participants' learning experiences was not, therefore, made as a decision from amongst competing choices; {*8 words deleted by censor* }. The argument is put forward that the I.L.E. is under-staffed and that a timetable which incorporated much more of the discovery-procedure approach to the methodology and theory components would be unwieldy and almost impossible to operate. {*89 words deleted by censor* }, not unlike those put forward by participants less willing to accept the reorientation of teaching in their own classrooms as to why the approaches proposed on the course itself cannot work in their situations. {*33 words deleted by censor* } They train (on {*13 words deleted by censor, replaced by*: We have not yet been able to give participants enough of} the kinds of learning experiences that we would wish them to give to their own pupils in school; {*4 words deleted by censor, replaced by*: or} of the exciting possibilities of designing and experimenting with innovative training materials, {*116 words deleted by censor* }. The more we attempt to persuade our participants of the classroom {*1 word deleted by censor, replaced by*: activities which} the syllabus and the new textbook approaches encourage, the more we receive demands to give 'demonstrations'. In a mid-course evaluation conducted by open-ended questionnaire in November, 1984, some 30% of participants requested that staff members should go into schools themselves and demonstrate the teaching by the methods they advocate through lectures. (Cf. Galton, 1982:7, who highlighted the dangers of modelling inherent in the 'master teacher' approach. He noted that it was usually the weaker trainees on pre-service courses who welcomed models.) Such demonstration is, of course, not impossible, if it is carried out over a realistic period and in appropriate circumstances {*inserted by the censor* : and it is being considered by the Institute}. When I was a member of the staff at the Regional Institute of English in Bangalore in India, we ran three-month courses for teachers very similar to those which I assist on in Hong Kong at present. In Bangalore, however, most members of the Institute staff had one class in a local school, for whose English language teaching they were responsible, or shared responsibility with the regular class teacher. The class was taught in the normal way, following the regular syllabus through the class textbook. This was an opportunity for us to show that the methodology that was being advocated at the Institute was directly applicable to the local school situation, and the experience permitted staff regularly to reappraise their own approaches and classroom techniques.

(The well known 'Bangalore Project' and the development of the 'communicational syllabus' in South India in the past five years is a direct result of the continual reassessment of practice characteristic of the pedagogical orientation of the R.I.E.) Some of our school lessons in Bangalore were timetables to be observed by course participants, some were not; the observed lessons were regular ones in the on-going programme of teaching, and not specially constructed demonstrations. The teaching of the classes carried on throughout the year, and the pupils took their regular school exams at the end of the third term. I like to think the results of these classes might have been better than those of classes not taught by R.I.E. staff, but, honestly, I cannot remember! { *52 words deleted by censor, replaced by* : I.L.E. staff members, not all of whom have had experience at the primary school level, are responsible for suggesting ways and means of using} a syllabus which is as yet untried { *8 words deleted by censor* }. The reactions of { *inserted by censor* : some of the I.L.E.} course participants are, { *1 word deleted by censor, replaced by* : therefore} predictable and understandable. However much one attempts to put across a particular philosophy, backed up with the literature of internationally renowned pandits, the staff's lack of direct personal experience of the participants' own classroom situation is not, in (*inserted by censor* : most of} the participants' views compensated for. { *3 words deleted by censor, replaced by* : However, what some of them lack, at present,} in experience { *11 words deleted by censor* } the majority of staff certainly make up for in enthusiasm, commitment and a general willingness to learn, though. { *54 words deleted by censor* }. Publishers { *35 words deleted by censor*}.

> We can see that a communicative English course is, in fact, easier to teach than a more traditional structural course.
> (Methold, 1983)

Teachers may be notoriously resistant to change; but, in my experience, thinking teachers have always been prepared to accept new ideas where they have been able to determine their relevance to their own classrooms. At the I.L.E., we perceive our task not as a mission to delude teachers with the *ignis fatuus* that any approach is inherently better or easier than any other - such promises cannot, in any case, be fulfilled - but as an attempt to persuade teachers to reflect on their experience and to marry what they consider as their own successes to the practical and theoretical insights of modern classroom research. We do have a problem in getting course participants to reflect critically about their own past experience, and to bring their own insights into play in approaching the new syllabus and textbooks. The { *1 word deleted by censor* } structure of { *1 word deleted by censor, replaced by* : the present} course does { *2 words deleted by censor, replaced by* : not} encourage { *inserted by censor* : enough} direct input by the participants themselves, except in lesson planning for the experimental teaching, and in the preparation of teaching materials such as puppets or slide shows.

> The point about training teachers is not to give them a theory, but to enable them to theorise, i.e., to think critically about their practice.
> (E.J. Neather, in James, 1983:2)

I have spoken about the constant reassessment of courses which occurred at the R.I.E. Bangalore, which has led that institute to the forefront of curent research developments in classroom methodology and syllabus design (in the 1970s, too, it was already a centre of excellence in the field, but, at that time, had not entered the international stage); before every course, there were intensive discussions amongst all the staff as to what had succeeded and what had failed during the previous one. I taught on four main courses during my time there, and each one had a different timetable and a different organisation, changed according to the perceptions of staff and participants as to how each course could be constantly revised and could be improved. The syllabus content remained the same, but there was a good deal of interesting experimentation with how the methodology element and language proficiency classes should be taught. (Admittedly, there was a goodly number of plenary lectures - student-centeredness was not, at that period, the guiding philosophy of the syllabus or of our course.) { *17 words deleted by censor* }.

> Too often, teacher training is viewed, even by those who organise and carry it out, as something rather simple and self-evident. But the comparison of teacher training programmes in different institutions, in different countries, under different leadership, reveals that a great many courses merely continue without change whatever has been offered in that institution for the past ten, twenty or thirty years. Nor is there sufficient awareness or discussion of the important points of choice. And when discussion does take place, it is frequently on the basis of 'our course is better than X's course', rather than on a basis of a rationale or model for teacher training.
> (Strevens, 1982:20-21)

{ *175 words deleted by censor* }. As an example, one may take the organisation of the experimental teaching component of the course. In a laudable effort to incorporate an essentially practical bias into the course structure, the designers included a compulsory element of supervised practical teaching for all course participants. The R.S.A.'s D.O.T.E. syllabus requires the continuous assessment of candidates' practical teaching throughout and beyond the period of the course of instruction, and this provision was reproduced in the syllabus of the I.L.E. courses. The R.S.A.'s syllabus explictly provides for the teaching to be being carried out in the candidates' own schools, and for assessments to be made on lessons over a period so that progress can be perceived by the assessor. The R.S.A. syllabus was designed for teachers taking part-time courses, whilst at the same time continuing to teach in their schools. The I.L.E. course is full-time, and the practical teaching component has had to be included within the four-month timetable. Course participants are divided into groups of 12 for administrative and tutorial purposes; each group of 12 is subdivided into threes or fours for the experimental teaching.

lesson, and everyone will have two turns during the course. The group prepares all the aids and teaching materials, and writes a plan which is approved by the tutor. The selected teacher teaches the lesson to a class of children in the nearby affiliated school, with the other eleven members of the peer group, and the tutor, observing at the back of the class. The experience is a very traumatic one for most teachers. Never since their pre-service training days have they ever been watched by colleagues whilst teaching; never have they been criticised, or have had the opportunity to criticise others on a professional basis. Each group and tutor watches two or three lessons in a morning, and then return to the Institute for a tutorial evaluation session. There is no doubt that the quality of the participants' presentations and the depth of their observations alter radically as the course progresses. However, we do have { *inserted by censor* : some} misgivings about the nature of the exercise.

This practical teaching element is called *experimental teaching*, for it is supposed to be just that. The objective is to have teachers experiment with techniques and procedures that they may have never attempted before. It is, therefore, inevitable that some experiments will fail, that some of the lessons will be unmitigated disasters. In fact, at the beginning of the course, most of the experiments *are* failures, and most of the lessons *are* disasters. They can, nevertheless, be an invaluable learning experience for all concerned, teacher and observers. In the evaluation session, the group can be given the opportunity to dissect the lesson - sometimes with a video recording - and pinpoint the areas where improvement can be made, noting these for future occasions, in order to monitor progress. *Prima facie*, the system appears ideal. However, two { *1 word deleted by censor* } problems have emerged. The first is that { *inserted by censor* : many of} the teachers, for whatever reasons, { *1 word deleted by censor, replaced by* : appear to dislike} the practical teaching exercise. They criticise the system because of having to 'teach' artificially in unfamiliar classes one-off lessons which they have not planned individually, often via a methodology totally alien to both class and teacher alike. Some staff insist on an inviolable principle that experimental teaching should be carried out solely in English. Consequently, teachers teaching the lower levels of the primary school are forced into the position of having to give instructions for activities in more elaborate language than the pupils are capable of understanding and certainly more elaborate than the language content of the lesson itself, or restricting themselves to banal activities capable of being explained or demonstrated simplistically. I feel that the use of the mother tongue is absolutely necessary in the very early stages of primary level, so that children can be given the opportunities of practising the new second language through interesting activities which they can understand. One experiment I carried out this course was the result of a disastrous lesson given by one of the participants. The level was lower primary. The group had designed a lesson which involved the pupils in reading labels and comparing prices of various articles in different shops.

The teacher brought to the classroom a number of boxes filled with labelled items such as soft drinks, sweets and chocolates. Each box represented one shop. The whole activity was explained in English, but once the worksheets had been distributed, and the pupils were told to go and make their comparisons, the class went wild. Children descended on the boxes, and carried off armfuls of the teaching aids. The teacher just lost control. The observing group took no part in the lesson, but watched until the end, when the lesson degenerated into near anarchy, with the teacher shouting commands in English which were ignored by the class. During the evaluation session, the group came to the conclusion that the lesson plan itself and the design of the activity were not necessarily at fault. The problem possibly lay in the fact that the teacher had restricted herself to speaking English in a situation where the mother tongue would have been more appropriate, not only in the explanation of the activity, but also for discipline. The group decided to repeat the same lesson with a class at the same level the following week, this time using a Cantonese introduction and instructions. The resulting lesson was excellent. Everyone understood what to do, and what was required of him or her. The class became involved in the activity, and the observing group noticed that the objectives of the lesson plan - that pupils should *read, understand, compare* and *note down, in English,* the prices of labelled articles - was realistically achieved. { *75 words deleted by censor* }. This brings into focus a complaint made by a number of participants, that the staff give conflicting advice, especially in the planning of lessons. We have endeavoured consistently to avoid imparting conflicting information in formal input sessions, though, in the nature of things, this cannot be totally excluded. Conflicting *advice,* however, confuses participants: they are unused to having to make choices; they want to be told "the answers". It takes them some time to accept that they have to reconcile the conflicts themselves, and even to reject all advice offered if they can suggest alternatives.

What, then, of the disastrous lessons? If the course participants *learn* from the mistakes of their peers through the observation and guided evaluation, the experiment has, in fact, succeeded. That it has been a failure in the classroom is neither here nor there (except inasmuch as the pupils' time has, unfortunately, been wasted), since the goal of the experimental teaching component of the course is to give the participants a unique opportunity to try out (or to see tried out) new techniques and procedures, and to evaluate them in the light of the experience. Unfortunately, { *9 words deleted by censor, replaced by*: this component does not seem to be perceived} in this light. Some staff use evaluation checklists for the experimental lessons, such as those produced by the R.S.A. for D.O.T.E. evaluation lessons. Participants { *inserted by censor* : naturally} want to show themselves off in their best light, even in the artificial circumstances of an unknown class watched by twelve peers. That the experimental teaching component of the course is known colloquially as "teaching practice" is symptomatic of the attitudes held towards it. Moreover, every experimental teaching session is { *inserted by censor* : at present} *graded*.

We return to the final step of Taba's (1962) model of curriculum processes, mentioned above.

Step 7 Determination of what to evaluate and means to evaluate

{*26 words deleted by censor*}. The question now is, do we grade a participant's performance in the classroom, which may be disastrous? If so, is it fair to award a bad grade to someone who has been willing to experiment with new materials, techniques or procedures in unfamiliar circumstances, in full expectation that not everything will necessarily succeed, but just for the learning experience? On the other hand, should we grade on the teacher-participant's own *post mortem* introspection? Furthermore, should we be using as an evaluation instrument a checklist designed for assessment in a public examination, for a classroom experiment? Or, indeed, any checklist at all? (M. Stubbs & Delamont, 1976; Ellis & Robinson, 1981; C.P. Hill in James, 1983:20-40; Hadley & Coker, 1983; Delson-Karan, 1984.) These problems, and many related to them, {*inserted by censor*: yet} been resolved. {*74 words deleted by censor*}. How can a staff, with no experience whatsoever of teaching at the level of the classes observed, be 'good judges' of the best practice in the circumstances? In general the staff acquit themselves commendably in their evaluations, {*11 words deleted by censor*}. That they enter into the exercise with outward gusto, if inward apprehension, is laudable. The system puts the staff in the unfamiliar rôle of conductors of evaluation, for which they have received little or no training, in the same way that course participants find themselves having to perform unnaturally - in unfamiliar classrooms, with unknown pupils and observed by a peer group. {*33 words deleted by censor*}. But the professionalism and integrity of both staff and participants do not allow the situation to become nugatory. The staff do feel they can give useful advice, and the participants do appreciate the experience of being evaluated by their peers - though few would admit it openly. That our experimental teaching should be the subject of a grading system is, however, quite wrong, in my view. Our present system is {*inserted by censor*: probably} counter-productive in that it {*1 word deleted by censor, replaced by*: may be} highly demotivating for the participants, and {*inserted by censor*: in that it} fosters a master-teacher/learner approach that one would, in the normal course of events, wish to avoid.

Summative and formative teacher evaluation

> Teacher evaluation is a disaster. The practices are shoddy and the principles are unclear. ..... one cannot yet point to a single exemplary system in which the practices come near to matching our knowledge.
> (M. Scriven, in Millman, 1981:244)

That some sort of evaluation procedure is necessary is evident. An institutional prerequisite is to distinguish the good from the merely adequate, and to reward, in some way, effort and progress. Moreover, there is a professional obligation to offer feedback to teachers on all aspects of their course work.

> Using classroom visits by colleagues (or administrators or "experts") to evaluate teaching is not just incorrect, it is a disgrace. First, the visit itself alters the teaching, so that the visitor is not looking at a representative sample. ..... Second, the number of visits is too small to be an accurate sample from which to generalize, even if it were a random sample. ..... nothing that could be observed in the classroom ..... can be used as a basis for an inference to any conclusion about the merit of the teaching. ..... regardless of the fact that no observations of teaching style can legitimately be used as a basis for inference about the merit of the teaching, the visitor normally believes the contrary. This is often because visitors have their own preferences as to a certain style or have many years of experience in teaching this same type of course or student. Consequently, they believe that not doing it their way, or perhaps in one or two other ways they approve, is doing it badly. ..... Ultimately, the problem about the visitor is the lack of similarity between the visitor's thought processes and those of the student.
> (M. Scriven, in Millman, 1981:251-251)

(Cf. Galton, 1982:7, who highlighted the 'perception gap' between trainees and assessors in teachging practice, and the problem of subjectivity and objectivity in teacher training and assessment.) Scriven (*op. cit.*) advocates student questionnaires and ratings, measurement of learning gains, and the compilation of professional development dossiers as adequate evaluation procedures, for the purposes of personnel decisions. Whilst at the I.L.E. our records may be consulted by tutors who have received requests for professional references from former participants, most of our evaluation {*inserted by censor* : at present} will be formative rather than summative, i.e., concerned with the professional development of the participants rather than with their career appointments. The rôle of the I.L.E. staff in evaluation is, thus, very different from that of the traditional one of an inspector. {*55 words deleted by censor*}.

In the formative development of our participants, the brief practice they have in their experimental teaching can be an extremely useful experience for them. Although most of the participants are over-apprehensive about the lessons and, during the course, describe them vehemently with such epithets as "horrifying", "a torture" or "a nightmare", responses in post-course questionnaires indicate that the majority of participants regard the experience as worthwhile in the long run.

> "I hate it, but it's good for me"

is typical of many such comments we receive. I am not certain whether this attitude is one we should be encouraging, nor am I sure how to avoid it {*4 words deleted by censor*}, particularly when participants are being graded on the exercise. What we {*3 words deleted by censor, replaced by* : are looking for} is a way of offering our participants the experience of experimenting in an atmosphere unencumbered by the {*1 word deleted by censor*} demands of the system, yet one in which they can benefit from a new learning experience and receive full and useful feedback not only on their performance but also on the ramifications of the experiment - how and what might be altered, for example, in a different situation or with a different class.

More important than the actual classroom performance, then, is the quality and extent of the observation undertaken by the peer group and the quality of the teacher-participant's self-assessment of his or her experimental lesson. In our courses, there is still { *3 words deleted by censor* } reticence on the part of peers to give frank assessments of what they observe; { *inserted by censor* : probably for cultural reasons,} very often, in post-lesson tutorial evaluation sessions, groups tend to emphasise the positive and gloss over the negative from the performance point of view, whereas that negative may very well be extremely positive from the experimental point of view. It is up to the staff to pinpoint those areas of strengths and weakness in performance which have general applicability to the nature of the experiment, { *16 words deleted by censor* }.

Some members of staff have attempted to structure their evaluation sessions in such a way as to encourage student participation. a chairman is selected from within the group, and he or she conducts the session and sums up the discussion. The tutor sits as an observer. It may be that this type of approach may offer us some insights into how we might, in the future, reorient our evaluation procedures. Evaluation grading would concentrate less on the actual classroom performance, more on the nature of the evaluation process. So far, in my experience, participants have been happy to sit back amd listen to tutors' comments on the lessons they have helped prepare or have observed. I feel that we should be working towards a much more integrated evaluation system, which discourages the tutor-student attitude to evaluation, and brings much of the responsibility for evaluation back to the peer group itself. We have not progressed very far along this road yet, but I feel that if we are to develop realistic ways of looking at our experimental teaching, we should hardly be looking at the minutiae of classroom performance for grading at all, but should be concentrating on providing our participants with the opportunity to inform themselves about the nature of the processes of classroom teaching - based not only on formal input and discussion, but also extracting from their own past training and experiences - to observe critically, to develop confidence in their own judgements and to be able to verbalise their reactions. If we { *1 word deleted by censor, replaced by*: are able to} evolve a grading system which { *1 word deleted by censor, replaced by*: takes} account of the way in which participants *evaluated* each others' experimental teaching rather than one which concentrates exclusively on one-off artificial performances, which can in no way inform on a teacher's qualities or abilities *qua* teacher, we { *1 word deleted by censor, replaced by*: shall} be on the way to solving some of the poroblems I have mentioned. An experiment could fail, a lesson could be disastrous, but this would not matter for the grading purpose; what would be important would be how the peer group observed the lesson, gave its critique of it and made suggestions for improvement or further work. This type of approach may help to enhance teacher motivation, may remove the terror from the classroom situation, and make for a fairer system all round.

Bibliography

Bolitho, R. & G.C. James (Eds) (1982) *Teacher Assessment*, report on the 1st Exeter seminar on the assessment of teachers of English as a foreign language, University of Exeter Language Centre

Book, C. (1975) "Contract grading in the interpersonal communication course," *Speech Teacher*, 24 133-138

Chau, L.-M.F. (1984) "Applicability of the communicative approach to Hong Kong secondary schools," paper read at the Seminar on Language Teaching in the Chinese Context, Chinese University of Hong Kong, August, 1984

Cheng, W. (1983) "The changing patterns of English language teaching in Hong Kong," *Chinese University Education Journal*, 11 86-95

Cheng, W. (1984) "Grammar teaching in perspective," *Chinese University Education Journal*, 12 78-87

Curriculum Development Committee (C.D.C.) (1976) *Syllabuses for Primary Schools - English (Primary 1-6)*, Hong Kong: Government Printer

Curriculum Development Committee (C.D.C.) (1981) *Syllabuses for Primary Schools - English (Primary 1-6)*, Hong Kong: Government Printer

Delson-Karan, M. (1984) "A three-dimensional approach to evaluating teaching performance," *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 40 414-428

Education Department (E.D.) (1981a) "Multi-million dollar package to boost language standards," Press release 110/81, 5th June, 1981 (Ref. 7/4/3393/71), Hong Kong

Education Department (E.D.) (1981b) "Language package for schools and community," Aided Schools General Circular 36/81, 30th July, 1981 (Ref. ED(SCH) L/5/81), Hong Kong

Education Department (E.D.) (1984) "Teacher training crucial to language learning," Press release 91/84, 5th May, 1984 (Ref. 22/4/3393/71), Hong Kong

Ellis, R. & B. Robinson (1981) "A reassessment of lesson evaluation in E.L.T.," *System*, 9 5-9

Etherton, A.R.B. (1981) "English language syllabuses in Hong Kong," *English Bulletin*, 7 9-18

Guterres, H. (1982) "$320m plan to boost languages," *South China Morning Post*, 6th June, 1982

Hensman, B. (1962) *Report of the 1962 Chung Chi Conference for Teachers of English as a Second Language*, mimeo, Hong Kong

Ho, S.-C.B. (1981) "Comments on the structural versus functional syllabus crisis at school level in Hong Kong," *English Language Teaching*, 35 325-328

Hong Kong Government (1952) *Report of the Committee on Higher Education in Hong Kong*

Hong Kong Government (1981) *The Hong Kong Education System*, Government Secretariat

James, G.C. (Ed.) (1983) *Teacher Assessment II*, Report on the 2nd Exeter seminar on the assessment of teachers of English as a foreign language, July 1983, University of Exeter Language Centre

Johnson, R.K. (1981) "On 'syllabuses' and on being 'communicative'," *English Bulletin*, 7 39-51

Kong, S. (1984a) "Language projects to aid teacher training," *Hong Kong Standard*, 23rd July, 1984

Kong, S. (1984b) "Shaping teacher training to suit student needs," *Hong Kong Standard*, 7th September, 1984

Llewellyn, Sir J. (Chairman) (1982) *A Perpective on Education in Hong Kong - report by a visiting panel*, Hong Kong: Government Printer

Methold, K. (Scriptwriter) (1983) *Primary English: Communicative Approach*, promotional film by Longman Group (Far East) Ltd, Hong Kong

Millman, J. (Ed.) (1981) *Handbook of Teacher Evaluation*, London: Sage

Newsham, G. (1984) "Performance objectives in E.S.L. teacher training," *TESL Talk*, 5 43-49

Pierson, H.D. (1981) "Curriculum development and the English syllabus in Hong Kong," *English Bulletin*, 7 26-38

Richards, J.C. (1984) "Language curriculum development," paper read at the American Language Institute, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, March 1984

Rodgers, T. (1979) "Teacher training: in progress," in Pettersen, N.H. (Ed.) *Developments in the Training of Teachers of English*, London: British Council (E.L.T. Documents 104), 84-98

Soar, R.S., D.M. Medley & H. Coker (1983) "Teacher evaluation: a critique of currently used methods," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65 239-246

Strevens, P.D. (1982) "Teacher training and the curriculum," paper read at a British Council seminar, Dunford House, 20th June, 1982

Stubbs, M. & S. Delamont (Eds) (1976) *Explorations in Classroom Observation*, Chichester: John Wiley

Tongue, R.K. (1979) "Three classrooms," *English Bulletin*, 7 9-13

Tongue, R.K. (1980) "Towards a more communicative English curriculum in Hong Kong secondary schools," *English Bulletin*, 7 9-11

Tongue, R.K. & J. Gibbons (1982) "Structural syllabuses and the young beginner," *Applied Linguistics*, 3 60-70